

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

AMADEO SANCHEZ,	)	3:11-cv-00310-LRH-WGC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b><u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u></b>
	)	
vs.	)	June 8, 2012
	)	
STATE OF NEVADA, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE WILLIAM G. COBB, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: KATIE LYNN OGDEN      REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

**MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:**

Before the Court is “Plaintiff’s Motion to Strike Defendant’s Responses to Plaintiff’s Reply and Supplemental Opposition.” (Doc. #58.) On June 5, 2012, the court addressed in a Report and Recommendation (Doc. #56) the propriety of Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss/Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. #16). As part of the formulation of the Court’s Report, the Court took into consideration extensive briefing the parties were permitted to submit, including:

- Doc. #20: Plaintiff’s Opposition
- Doc. #23: Defendant’s Reply
- Doc. #40: Plaintiff’s Opposition
- Doc. #44: Defendant’s Reply to Plaintiff’s Opposition
- Doc. #45: Plaintiff’s “Reply to Defendants (sic) Reply to Opposition”
- Doc. ##51, 51-1: Plaintiff’s Supplemental Opposition
- Doc. #55: Defendants’ Response to Plaintiff’s Supplemental Briefs

As noted above, the Court thereafter entered its Report and Recommendation (Doc. #56) on June 5, 2012. Therein the Court recommended granting Defendants’ Motion.

# MINUTES OF THE COURT

3:11-cv-00310-LRH-WGC

Date: June 8, 2012

Page 2

The Court has considered “Plaintiff’s Motion to Strike Defendant’s Supplemental Opposition” (Doc. #58). The Court finds plaintiff’s motion (Doc. #58) adds no new substantive information with respect to the underlying motion (Doc. #16). The Court also finds plaintiff’s attempts to strike the defendants’ memoranda to be without merit.

Plaintiff's motion to strike ( Doc. #58) is therefore **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

LANCE S. WILSON, CLERK

By: \_\_\_\_\_ /s/  
Deputy Clerk